	l4fdeasc Videoconference							
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT							
2	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK							
3	EASTERN PROFIT CORPORATION LIMITED,							
4	Plaintiff, New York, N.Y.							
5	v. 18 Civ. 2185(LJL)							
6	STRATEGIC VISION US LLC,							
7	Defendant.							
8	x							
9	April 15, 2021							
10	2:00 p.m.							
11	Before:							
12	HON. LEWIS J. LIMAN,							
13	District Judge							
14	APPEARANCES (via Zoom platform)							
15	TROUTMAN PEPPER HAMILTON SANDERS LLP Attorneys for Plaintiff BY: JOANNA J. CLINE CHRISTOPHER B. CHUFF							
16								
17	GRAVES GARRETT, L.L.C.							
18	Attorneys for Defendant BY: EDWARD DEAN GREIM							
19	JENNIFER A. DONNELLI							
20								
21								
22								
23								
24								
25								

Videoconference

(Video conference established)

THE CLERK: Let me just remind everyone again, before the Judge begins, that this is a public proceeding. Members of the public and press are able to access this proceeding through the audio-only line that has been set on the public docket. So anyone on that line, anyone on this Zoom is reminded that any recording or rebroadcasting of any portion of this proceeding is strictly prohibited.

THE COURT: Very well. This is Judge Liman.

Would counsel identify themselves for the record, starting with the plaintiff?

MS. CLINE: Yes. Good afternoon, your Honor. This is Joanna Cline, at Troutman Pepper, for Eastern Profit, and with me on the Zoom is my colleague Chris Chuff.

MR. CHUFF: Good afternoon, your Honor.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, Ms. Cline, Mr. Chuff.

For defendants.

MR. GREIM: Your Honor, this is Eddie Greim, Graves
Garrett, for Strategic Vision, and with me just off screen is
Jennifer Donnelli.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, Mr. Greim.

Before we get started, I want to reiterate some things that my deputy clerk said. The first point is to highlight that it is illegal for anybody to record or rebroadcast any portion of these proceedings, including by live casting or

Videoconference

putting it on YouTube or any of those other vehicles. Anyone who does so can be subject to civil and criminal penalties for contempt of court.

Second of all, I would ask each counsel when they speak to please identify themselves for the record for the benefit of the court reporter. Please speak slowly and clearly. I'll try to make sure that I give each party an opportunity to speak.

And, third, please do not interrupt each other or me.

It's difficult sometimes to do things by Zoom without being able to be in one's presence, and it is a little bit easier if you do not interrupt one another.

So, with that said, this is a pretrial conference. We're prepared to go to trial Monday. There are a couple of preliminaries that I want to go through and some rulings that I will be able to give each of you, and then I'm prepared to hear each counsel if there is anything else that they would like to address.

The first thing that I would like to ask the parties about is that I understand there is a request with respect to one of the witnesses, that that witness enter the courthouse through a secure or some other entrance other than the regular court entrance. I'm not sure which counsel has made that request with respect to which witness, but I'm prepared to hear that application now.

Videoconference

MS. CLINE: Yes, your Honor. Thank you. This is Joanna Cline on behalf of the plaintiff.

We're making the request actually on behalf of Mr. Guo Wengui, who is a third-party witness here, basically. So, we do not represent him but we have been informed by his counsel that he typically travels with security, with a security detail, and he has asked whether he may be permitted to access the court through sort of a nonpublic entrance with his security guards. He just — he fears for his own safety, and he thinks that the trial — the happenings at trial are likely to get some attention, and he is just nervous that there will be some risk to his safety.

THE COURT: Does the other side have a position?

MR. GREIM: No, your Honor. We have no position.

THE COURT: OK. I'm going to deny that application, subject to it being renewed if there are additional facts that come to my attention. This courthouse is a courthouse that attracts people with some name and notoriety and in the past has also attracted people who claim that they have some security issues. So, I don't hear anything with respect to this particular witness that distinguishes him from others of similar notoriety who appear in this court as witnesses.

If there is some specific threat to the witness' safety, then I would be prepared to hear a new application, but absent there being something specific and concrete, and based

Videoconference

upon the application right now, that application is denied.

THE COURT: Second, I have before me a number of requests to enter the courthouse with electronic devices. I will sign those. Those appear to be in order. If they are not in order, I will let you know, but from my review those appear in order. Those will be signed.

The next point that I would like to mention is that with respect to the schedule of the trial, my expectation is that we will start each day at 9:30 in the morning and go until about 4 p.m. in the afternoon. Later in this conference, I am going to ask each side how long we expect each witness to testify so that we can get some sense of both the length of the trial -- you know that I have limited you to -- we are finishing on Thursday of next week. My expectation from the list of witnesses is that we will finish before then. So, I want to get some sense of the length of the trial. I also will try to sequence the witnesses so that we don't have people waiting unnecessarily, with the health risks that those present.

The next thing is that I would like to command to each counsel and direct each counsel to review on the court's website the Court's standing order with respect to COVID restrictions and the questionnaire that the witnesses and the lawyers and anybody entering the courthouse has to fill out before they enter the courthouse. Although we're starting at

Videoconference

9:30 in the morning, each of you should arrive before that time so as to make sure that you get into the courthouse without there being any delay.

Let me direct myself first to Ms. Cline with respect to that and then to Mr. Greim.

Ms. Cline, do you anticipate any issues with respect to any of your witnesses being able to enter the courthouse?

MS. CLINE: No, your Honor, other than the application which has been denied.

THE COURT: Mr. Greim?

MR. GREIM: No, your Honor. And if I recall, there may be a separate entrance which is faster for attorneys that looks out onto -- towards Chinatown. Is there a certain entrance we ought to be using just to save time?

THE COURT: I believe that that is the only entrance that the parties can use right now. There is an entrance on that end of the courthouse for lawyers. There is also a separate entrance again on that side of the courthouse for people who are not admitted to the bar. So the same side of the courthouse for both lawyers and for nonlawyers, but the lawyers, you should be able to get in a little bit more quickly. Thank you for raising that.

We'll start with opening arguments on Monday. My anticipation is that each side will have half an hour for opening arguments, and then we'll proceed immediately after

Videoconference

that to the first witness.

I've indicated before that with respect to closing statements, those will take place after the trial is concluded and with some delay, and I think we've entered an order indicating that I'll hear closing arguments remotely on April 30th at 1 p.m. Those will be limited to one hour each.

Both with respect to openings and with respect to closings, the plaintiff will go first and then the defendant will go second.

Particularly with respect to closings, I would highlight for both of you that the closings will be most useful to me to the extent that they are able to identify concrete pieces of evidence and concrete documents or transcript cites that the parties want me to focus on.

As I've also indicated, I will review the depositions separately and will review them prior to closing statements on the 30th, but those are not to be presented in court except to the extent that anybody is going to use any portion of a deposition, for example, to cross-examine a witness.

Obviously, my ruling is not intended to prohibit or limit the ability to use a deposition excerpt to cross-examine a witness.

I've got a series of evidentiary objections. I indicated to the parties that they could submit to me documents as to which they requested a preliminary ruling as to admissibility and that I would give those rulings, to the

Videoconference

extent that I could, to help inform you with respect to the admissibility of documents otherwise. I'll give you those in a moment.

Let me tell you with respect to documents and exhibits otherwise during the trial, my intent is to receive exhibits subject to a motion to strike. I'm doing that for efficiency purposes. It's a bench trial. There is no risk of undue prejudice (inaudible) by showing me a document. I would have to see the document anyway if I am going to rule with respect to evidentiary issues, and I'm confident in my ability to focus on what's admissible and not admissible. My guess, if this case is anything like past cases, is that there will be some documents as to which I don't need to rule as to admissibility because regardless of my ruling, they wouldn't make a difference and I wouldn't be relying upon them either way. So just in terms of judicial efficiency, it's easier that way.

And my request would be that the parties make their objections as to exhibits at the end of each trial day. By the close of that trial day, you can submit on ECF a letter indicating the exhibits to which you object. Why don't we say by 8 p.m. on the end of each day, the party who is objecting will just tell me what they are objecting to and simply the basis on which you are objecting much as if you were in court. No speaking objections by letter any more than there would be in court. If I need argument, I'll let you know.

Videoconference

With respect to the particular exhibits that I identified -- I'm sorry, that the parties identified, here are my rulings:

DX113C to H, the objection is sustained. Strategic seeks to offer these articles for the truth of the matter asserted, but does not identify a hearsay exception that would permit receipt of the documents. They are not the appropriate subject of judicial notice. The documents are also irrelevant under Rule 401, and their probative value is outweighed by their prejudicial impact under Rule 403. The ruling does not preclude Strategic from using the document to confront witnesses on cross-examination without receipt of them into evidence or use for the truth absent an appropriate foundation being laid.

DX118, the objection is sustained. My ruling is identical as to the ruling with respect to 113 and for the same reasons.

As to DX119, the Court reserves judgment. The document may be used at trial subject to a motion to strike, and the parties will need to -- the proponent of the exhibit will need to establish an appropriate foundation for the document.

DX112, the objection is sustained. The exhibit is excluded under Federal Rules of Evidence 401, 403, and is hearsay.

Videoconference

DX97 A through F, the Court reserves judgment. The exhibit may be used at trial subject to a motion to strike. The proponent of the exhibit will need to make sure to lay a proper foundation.

PX30, the objection is overruled. The exhibit will be received but not for the truth.

PX54, the Court reserves judgment. The document may be used at trial subject to a motion to strike. Again, the proponent will need to establish an appropriate foundation and the relevance.

PX52A, the Court reserves judgment. The exhibit may be used at trial subject to a motion to strike. The proponent of the exhibit will need to establish a proper foundation, including that the exhibit can be used as a prior consistent statement. That is, with respect to 52A, my understanding is that that exhibit is being offered to show prior consistent statements. It is admissible only if the witness is impeached as to his current testimony based upon a claim of recent fabrication under the rules.

So those are my rulings and that concludes what I had intended to address today.

Let me turn first to you, Ms. Cline, and then to Mr. Greim with respect to any additional matters we should cover?

Ms. Cline, you are on mute.

Videoconference

MS. CLINE: Apologies. Too many screens.

THE COURT: I can hear you now.

MS. CLINE: OK. Thank you.

I guess -- I think the only remaining -- well, two issues from our perspective and I guess they are interrelated.

Following up on the Court's comments regarding sort of an order of witnesses, number one, Mr. Greim and I have conferred and we think we can submit to the Court sort of our best guess as to who will testify when.

THE COURT: Great.

MS. CLINE: So we have that figured out.

And then I guess relatedly from our perspective we wanted to confirm the Court's understanding that each side —basically you have given us a maximum of four days, that each of us is to go no longer than two days with our respective testimony.

THE COURT: That's correct, and I'll have a clock just to make sure. I keep track of the time and I'll do it from 9:30 to -- Ms. Cline, I'm glad that you raised it. You know, the trial day will be 9:30 to 4 with a one-hour break for lunch and two 15-minute breaks during the day. So you can do the math, I can't do it right here, but we'll do the math and then we'll divide by two and that will be the allocated time for each side.

Are you prepared right now to -- well, I should say

		er	

one other thing before I ask the question. I understand that the parties have also agreed that the scope of cross-examination may exceed the scope of direct, given the parties' agreement and my ruling that each witness will only go once absent a showing of good cause. With that said,

Ms. Cline, are you prepared right now to tell me your estimate of length of time and when each witness would appear?

MS. CLINE: Sure. Let me start by just kind of -- I can share with the Court what Mr. Greim and I tentatively agreed to. We didn't put it in terms of hours but in terms of days and then we can drill down, if you would like, in terms of hours.

Shall I proceed?

THE COURT: Just give me one moment just to call up your list of witnesses.

(Pause)

OK. Please proceed.

MS. CLINE: OK. So we had contemplated on day one of trial, obviously the parties would do openings and then we would proceed with Ms. Wallop, W-a-l-l-o-p, and presumably start Mr. Waller, W-a-l-l-e-r.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. CLINE: On day two, we believe we can finish with Waller and then start Ms. Wang, W-a-n-g.

THE COURT: OK.

Videoconference

MS. CLINE: On day three, we would continue Ms. Wang if she is not done. Then we would go to Mr. Han, H-a-n, and then we would start with Mr. Guo, G-u-o. And on day four, we would anticipate finishing with Mr. Guo. And Mr. Greim, I'll let him chime in with respect to what he wants to say about that, but he also has an additional witness, Ms. Gong, G-o-n-g, who would be called on day four.

THE COURT: Is there any objection, Ms. Cline, to that last witness, G-o-n-g?

MS. CLINE: No. And I'm sorry for being unclear. I think Mr. Greim would say that prior to calling Ms. Gong, he wants to reserve a right, upon a showing of good cause, to recall prior witnesses. We don't agree with that, but I didn't want to be misleading about what his position is.

THE COURT: I understand that that's Mr. Greim's position, and I've given him leave, upon a showing of good cause, to recall just Wallop and Waller.

That order is fine and those estimates are fine.

What I would ask the parties to do is tomorrow and over the weekend meet and confer with respect to the estimated time for each witness and by Sunday night to submit to me the time estimates. And you should have the succeeding witnesses lined up. So, for example, if Wallop and Waller are day one, I would expect that Han would be in a location where, if we move quickly enough, you know, you will be able to bring Han down to

Videoconference

the courthouse.

Mr. Greim, what else should we -- do you have to add?

MR. GREIM: Well, I think between you, your Honor, and

Ms. Cline, you have basically stated my position.

My only hope is that we could move a little quicker so that just in case we hear things from the plaintiff's witnesses that weren't somehow covered because my main witnesses will be done, then I will be able to put on either Ms. Wallop or Mr. Waller and have them cover whatever that new matter was. But I'm just repeating what we've already discussed, so -- and I know I would have to make an application to do that, your Honor.

THE COURT: Right. So just to have in mind, you know, in terms of recalling Wallop and Waller, my view doesn't tie completely into the amount of time that it would take as much as the efficiency issues. So even if we finish very early, you should not count on the ability to recall Wallop and Waller. But I hear your comment with respect to the efficiency of the trial, and that's the reason why I want to make sure that the witness — first witness who would begin on the next day is available to testify on the prior day so that if the parties are wrong on their estimates, we can go more quickly.

All right. Anything else, Mr. Greim?

MR. GREIM: I'm checking with my team here.

Oh, yes. Yes, there is. I almost forgot. Your

Videoconference

Honor, we wondered whether our -- Ms. Midell, who is our paralegal, could have maybe 30 minutes of access to the courtroom on Friday just to make sure everything plugs in properly and that we've got the right adapters and things like that. I'm guessing the plaintiff might want the same thing.

THE COURT: Is that true, Ms. Cline?

MS. CLINE: We actually don't plan to be in the courtroom on Friday, but we don't object to Mr. Greim's request.

THE COURT: Let me ask my courtroom deputy. I'm sure that we can figure out a way to arrange that with the courthouse staff, but, Mat, what's the best thing for Strategic to do?

THE CLERK: I can arrange for the courtroom to be opened for whatever time they would like to go in, and then I will have someone lock it up once them leave.

THE COURT: Mr. Greim, why don't you email chambers with whatever your request is and copy Ms. Cline, obviously, and we'll make sure that that happens.

I should have said this, but, you know, obviously -maybe not "obviously." The proceedings will be -- the parties
will be able to listen to the proceedings by telephone, so will
the public, and the courthouse is open. So to the extent that
there is room in the courtroom, members of the public can sit
in the courtroom itself. It's all socially distanced. You

Case 1:18-cv-02185-LJL Document 347 Filed 04/21/21 Page 16 of 16 16 14fdeasc Videoconference will see that from the court's standing order. 1 2 One last thing. The parties should order at the end 3 of the day the transcript on an expedited basis and should 4 split the cost of the transcript. 5 Ms. Cline, anything else from you? 6 MS. CLINE: Just what time is the courtroom open on 7 Monday morning? THE COURT: Mat, will it be open by 9 o'clock or 8 9 earlier? 10 THE CLERK: It will definitely be open by 9., probably earlier. I'm guessing by about 8:30. 11 12 MS. CLINE: Good. Thank you. 13 THE COURT: All right. Well, I look forward to seeing 14 everybody on Monday. Thank you for the work. Have a good 15 weekend. Stay safe and stay healthy. 16 MR. GREIM: You, too, your Honor. 17 MS. CLINE: Thank you, your Honor. 18 (Adjourned) 19 20 21 22

23

24

25